

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Harrison Tyler Suggs,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	C/A No.: 2:14-02414-TLW
Carolyn W. Colvin,)	
Acting Commissioner of Social Security)	
Administration,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

The Plaintiff, Harrison Tyler Suggs (“Plaintiff”), brought this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 405(g) to obtain judicial review of a final decision of the Commissioner of Social Security (“Defendant”), denying the Plaintiff’s claim for Supplemental Security Income. (Doc. #1).

On July 23, 2015, United States Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker issued a Report and Recommendation (the “Original Report”) analyzing the Plaintiff’s first assertion of error, namely that the Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) improperly weighed the opinions of two non-treating psychologists. (Doc. #27). After conducting a de novo review of the Original Report, the record, and the relevant filings, this Court did not accept the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as to the Plaintiff’s first argument. Accordingly, this Court entered an Order on September 22, 2015 (Doc. #32) remanding the above-captioned matter to the Magistrate Judge for consideration of the Plaintiff’s additional allegations of error and a Supplemental Report and Recommendation.

This matter is now before the Court for review of the Supplemental Report and Recommendation (“the Supplemental Report”) filed on October 7, 2015 by United States

Magistrate Judge Mary Gordon Baker, to whom this case was previously assigned pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC. (Doc. #35). In the Supplemental Report, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the Commissioner's decision be affirmed. The deadline to file Objections to the Supplemental Report expired on October 26, 2015. (See Doc. #35). Neither party filed Objections to the Supplemental Report.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that Report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

This Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Supplemental Report and Recommendation, the record, and the briefs and memoranda submitted by the parties. For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, it is **ORDERED** that the Supplemental Report and Recommendation (Doc. #35) be **ACCEPTED** and the Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Terry L. Wooten
TERRY L. WOOTEN
Chief United States District Judge

November 5, 2015
Columbia, South Carolina